GABRIEAL McCAIN,

FOGARTY,

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Plaintiff,

Plaintill,

Defendants.

CIV S-05-0854 GEB PAN PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

V.

DEPENDENCY ASSOCIATES OF SACRAMENTO, KATHERINE M.

-∘○∘-

On May 19, 2005, this court granted plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis but dismissed plaintiff's complaint on the ground it failed to set forth a claim upon which this court may grant relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). The court directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint within twenty days or by June 13, 2005.¹ The court warned that "[f]ailure timely to amend the complaint may result in a recommendation this

 $^{^{1}\,}$ This period includes an additional three days for service pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(e).

Case 2:05-cv-00854-GEB-PAN Document 6 Filed 06/30/05 Page 2 of 3

action be dismissed. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)."

Plaintiff has neither filed an amended complaint nor otherwise responded to the court's order.

Accordingly, I recommend this action be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to prosecute. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)

(dismissal warranted for "failure of the plaintiff to prosecute or comply with these rules or any order of court"); see also,

Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f) (authorizing dismissal pursuant to Rule 37(b)(2)(C) "[i]f a party . . . fails to obey a . . . pretrial order"); E. D. Cal. L. R. 11-110 ("[f]ailure of . . . a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the court").

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the Honorable Garland E. Burrell, Jr., the United States District Judge assigned to this case. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Written objections may be filed within ten days after being served with these findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The failure to file objections within the

22 ////

- 23 ////
- 24 ////
- 25 ////
- 26 ////

| 1 | specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's |
|-----|---|
| 2 | order. <u>Martinez v. Ylst</u> , 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). |
| 3 | Dated: June 29, 2005. |
| 4 | /s/ Peter A. Nowinski |
| 5 | PETER A. NOWINSKI Magistrate Judge |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| L 4 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |